

to simply say we're going to effect these cuts to the university system and at the same time tell the university system they can't increase tuition rates is wrong. I think that this is a bad amendment. It reflects bad policy. I would not vote for it.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Higgins. May we have order in the Chamber, please. There is conversational noise coming from every quarter of this room (gavel) and we cannot possibly hear the speaker. Keep your conversational tones down, please. Senator Higgins.

SENATOR HIGGINS: Thank you, Mr. President, I would like to ask Senator Vickers a question or two if he would yield please for clarification.

PRESIDENT: Senator Vickers, you're on hand to answer questions.

SENATOR HIGGINS: Senator Vickers, I'm merely asking this question to get it into the record so that if there is any doubt in the future as to what you intended, it will be in the record.

SENATOR VICKERS: Okay, fine.

SENATOR HIGGINS: Line 19 of the amendment that you handed out, each agency shall absorb the reduction to the general fund appropriation made for fiscal year '85-86 by the Beutler-Vickers amendment with the least possible adverse effect on direct services to the public. By the public, would it also be interpreted with the least adverse effect on direct services to that agency's clients?

SENATOR VICKERS: Most certainly.

SENATOR HIGGINS: In other words, what I am saying is what I have perceived in my home town is that when cuts are made in agencies, very often they make them at the bottom with the people that are providing the direct services. As an example, those who would be teaching the visually impaired they might fire a teacher but keep an assistant to the assistant to the assistant, assistant director. So it is your intent with this amendment to send a message to the agencies that receive the cuts, that they will not cut first those people who deal directly with the clients of the